

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 and 14-21 were pending and examined. The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 9-12, and 14-21 under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over Wilcox (US 5,199,077) in view of Lee (SU 6,067,520) and claims 7 and 8 under 35 USC § 103(a) as unpatentable over Wilcox and Lee in view of well known prior art.

In response to the rejection of independent claims 1 and 15 as unpatentable over Wilcox and Lee, Applicant has amended these independent claims to recite that the input sample that is used for comparison is a text sample. Support for this amendment is found in the specification at the paragraph beginning on page 4 line 16. The cited references fail to disclose or suggest an audio locator/indexing system that operates on text as input. The Examiner states that Wilcox "teaches implementation of the keyword spotting system with word processed documents at col. 11, lines 20-25." Quoting from this portion of the reference, Wilcox states: "For example, as the input speech is being scanned for keywords, the sound waveform of the utterance can be displayed and scrolls along the screen during the scanning process, with a spotted keyword highlighted in the same manner that word finders highlight text in word-processed documents."

It is clear from the cited passage that Wilcox refers to highlighted text in word processed documents to illustrate the manner in which *input speech* can be displayed to a user. The very passage referred to by the Examiner explicitly indicates that it is discussing input speech. There is simply no discussion or suggestion to modify the teaching of Wilcox to receive text samples as input. Similarly Lee contains no teaching or suggestion to receive input text. To the contrary, Lee is specifically directed at a method/system for converting Mandarin audio segments into Chinese characters. If the input in Lee were in the form of Chinese characters (i.e., text) already, the invention would be unnecessary. If the input in Lee were text in any other form, the invention would be unworkable since it relies on a strong correlation between the spoken Mandarin monosyllables and the corresponding Chinese characters. Accordingly, Applicant would respectfully submit that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest the use of text input as recited in the remaining pending independent claims. Applicant would, therefore, request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the Section 103(a) rejection of the pending independent claims in light of the amendments and the accompanying remarks. The remaining dependent

claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance based on their dependencies on non-obvious independent claims (MPEP 2143.03).

CONCLUSION

In the present response, Applicant has to the Examiner's claim rejections under 35 USC 103(a), which is the only issue remaining in the application. Accordingly, Applicant believes that this response constitutes a complete response to each of the issues raised in the office action. In light of the amendments made herein and the accompanying remarks, Applicant believes that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant would request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections, allow the pending claims, and advance the application to issue. If the Examiner has any questions, comments, or suggestions, the undersigned attorney would welcome and encourage a telephone conference at 512.428.9872.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph P. Lally
Reg. No. 38,947
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

DEWAN & LALLY, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 684749
Austin, Texas 78768-4749
512.428.9870
512.428.9871 (FAX)

JPL/mm